

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
~~Security Information~~

28 August 1952

MEMORANDUM FOR: Participants in the USSR and Southeast Asia Area Programs  
conducted by the Office of Training, summer 1952.

SUBJECT : Evaluation of Program.

The Office of Training wishes to prepare an evaluation of the two summer area programs held during July and August. This evaluation depends primarily on your assessments. It will be used for guidance in planning future related programs. Your contribution of comment and constructive suggestions will be much appreciated (It is emphasized that collection of only favorable, or unfavorable comments is not the object of this assessment. It is desired to assemble objective favorable and unfavorable comments as guidance for planning future related programs). It is suggested that your remarks include comments on the following points.

1. Do you feel that this type of area program can contribute to increasing analyst effectiveness? If so, why? If not, why not? What type of program would be more useful?

2. Do you feel that this particular program was useful to you? If so, how? If not, why not?

3. Please comment on the following:

a. Content and scope of subject matter (Particularly, did you feel that it was relevant or irrelevant to your normal work problems; that it was possibly relevant, but of a nature that it is assumed analysts in your component necessarily have before they can qualify for the work for which they were employed; that it was relevant, but too general or too specific.)

b. Manner and method of presentation.

c. Time allotted for course (Was the number of weeks inadequate, adequate or excessive? Was the period of two hours for each session too short, satisfactory, or too long?)

d. Was the balance between lecture and discussion satisfactory, or do you feel that it would have been helpful to have more discussion or less discussion? Would you favor having certain periods devoted entirely to discussion of selected problems?

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
~~Security Information~~

CONFIDENTIAL  
Security Information

- 2 -

4. Do you approve of the policy that students not be required to do collateral reading or prepare papers, or do you think it would be both reasonable and useful if students expected to do limited reading and preparation of papers?

In addition to your remarks on the above points, any other comments or suggestions that you may wish to contribute for improvement of future related programs will be appreciated.

Please forward your written comments to  Building as early as possible.

Room 1301, "I" 25X1

1. The high degree of specialization in one particular field which most analysts must develop most often leads to neglect of other aspects of life or activity in the area concerned. Since the ~~the~~ political, economic, sociological, and military fields are so closely interrelated in Communist countries, an intelligent understanding of one field depends to a large extent on knowledge of the others. From this point of view, the type of area program presented ~~in the course of~~ this summer, which consisted of, in the case of the USSR course, considerations of Soviet history, politics, and economics, was of decided value.

2. The reasons for my feeling that this particular program was of only limited value to me are stated in 3.

3. As far as Professor Adams' course is concerned, I believe that knowledge of Soviet history, tracing the development of Soviet institutions and domestic and foreign policy, must be relevant to work in any Soviet field, no matter how current ~~the~~ that work might be. This is, of course, especially true in my own field of politics. However, Prof Adams' conduct of the course vitiated any value a consideration of Soviet history could ~~have~~ have for me. The primary deficiency I found in the course was Prof Adams' tendency towards facile, often misleading generalizations, usually supported by partial evidence. Facts ~~was~~ seemed either to be ignored or insufficiently considered. Discussion was made futile by the professor's inept direction of it. Indeed, when he encouraged it in the first part of his course, it frequently degenerated into polemic and stultification. The organization of the course had obvious defects also -- too much time was devoted <sup>to the early years of the Revolution</sup> to the early years of the Revolution. Although I attended only the first half of Professor Gurian's course, it was ~~was~~ extraordinarily stimulating and organized in such a way as to give the student a very clear understanding of the evolution of basic principles of Communist theory as they have been put into practice or used by the Soviet dictatorship. Inasmuch as I went on leave before Professor Boddie began his consideration of Soviet economics proper, I am not competent to give an evaluation of his course.

Time allotted for the course, from the points of view both of over-all length of the courses and of individual class sessions, seemed satisfactory.

4. Although I am not certain of the utility of preparing papers, except in those cases where the individual analyst feels that such systematic work under the guidance of a specialist would be of value to him, I feel very strongly that such courses would be much more meaningful if the participants were required to read certain basic works. In such a way, the instructor could be assured that references he might make to events in order to illustrate a certain point are understood by all and do not require a time-consuming explanation, which could <sup>CONFIDENTIAL</sup> easily be found in any number of books. Where assumptions were made <sup>Security Information</sup> of our knowledge, they frequently proved to be unjustified.